DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 529 FL 020 225

AUTHOR Kachru, Yamuna
TITLE Interpreting Indian English Expository Prose.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 14p.; For the complete volume, see FL 020 221.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Issues and Developments in English and Applied Linguistics (IDEAL); v3 p39-50 1988

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Context; Cultural Traits; *Discourse Analysis; *English; *Expository Writing; Intercultural Communication; Language Research; *Language Variation; Linguistic Theory; Literary Criticism; *Regional Dialects; *Sociocultural Patterns
IDENTIFIERS *English (Indian)

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to demonstrate that expository prose written in Indian English exhibits certain characteristics determined by the sociocultural conventions of writing in the Indian tradition. These features of Indian English texts are often judged to be inappropriate by native speakers of North American and British English, and mistakenly attributed to a lack of knowledge of the linguistic conventions of English on the part of the Indian English writer. The report discusses data drawn from newspapers, magazines, books, papers on literary criticism, and textbooks and papers on linguistics, and points out the need for developing awareness and appreciation of different conventions of writing in non-native forms of English. It is concluded that a lack of such awareness and appreciation will lead to failure in cross-cultural communication through the written mode in English. A 42-item bibliography is appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345529

Interpreting Indian English Expository Prose

Author: Yamuna Kachru

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wayne Dickerson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 020 225

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IDEAL 3, 1988

INTERPRETING INDIAN ENGLISH EXPOSITORY PROSE

Yamuna Kachru

Researchers interested in discourse analysis have recently begun to look into the question of what role sociocultural norms of a speech community play in determining the nature of written language. It is becoming increasingly clear that social perceptions of the nature of literacy, functions of literacy in a given sociocultural context, and conventions of verbal interaction have an effect on not only what, but how people write. Very few empirical studies, however, are available to illustrate the effect of sociocultural conventions of writing on texts produced in a given community. This study is an attempt to demonstrate that expository prose written in Indian English exhibits certain characteristics which are determined by the sociocultural conventions of writing in the Indian tradition. These features of Indian English texts are frequently judged to be inappropriate by the native speakers of American and British English, and mistakenly attributed to a lack of knowledge of the linguistic conventions of English on the part of the Indian English writers. The paper discusses data drawn from newspapers, magazines, books and papers on literary criticism, and textbooks and papers on linguistics, and points out the need for developing awareness and appreciation of different conventions of writing in non-native Englishes. A lack of such awareness and appreciation is bound to lead to failure in cross-cultural communication through the written mode in English.

INTRODUCTION

The unprecedented spread of English around the world has had several consequences for the language and its users - whether native or non-native. As a result of international acculturation of the language, several localized varieties have come into existence and there is serious concern about what is generally referred to as the problem of intelligibility among the users of different varieties. Although some work has been done on phonological and other linguistic factors responsible for intelligibility across speakers of different native and non-native varieties (see Smith and Nelson 1985), very little attention has been paid to other aspects of spoken/ written communication among speakers/writers/readers from different parts of the world (but, see Gumperz 1982a, 1982b, B. Kachru 1982, 1987, among others, for a beginning). It will not be an exaggeration to say that research in this area is still in the stage of consciousness raising. Nevertheless, the time has come to initiate serious empirical research into the factors that are responsible for success or failure in communication through the spoken as well as the written mode. Since expository writing is one important medium of written communication across cultures, this study is an attempt to characterize a set of factors that determine to a significant extent how texts created in a sociocultural context are interpreted by readers from a different sociocultural context. The set of factors I am referring to are linguistic as well as sociocultural.

A significant part of recent research in fields related to use of language such as sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, discourse analysis (including conversational analysis) has been concerned with how socio-cultural norms influence thought patterns (e.g., Kaplan 1966 (also, 1980), Scribner 1979, Tannen 1980), verbal interactions (e.g., Tannen 1984), patterns and use of literacy (e.g., Besnier 1986, Heath 1981, 1983, Scollon and Scollon 1981), and structure and strategies in written discourse (e.g., Whiteman 1981). This paper is a brief attempt to characterize conventions - both linguistic

FL 020 225

and discourse structural - that are followed in Indian English writing and show that these derive from the conventions of Indian writing, i.e., writing in the languages of India. I am not arguing in favor of a wholesale transfer of conventions from Indian languages to Indian English, I only wish to demonstrate that familiarity with more than one set of conventions results in a totally new one which is neither identical with the native English, nor with the indigenous set. However, there is enough evidence that the new conventions share a significant subset of the indigenous features of writing.

I will first present some evidence to demonstrate that there is a set of conventions of writing that characterizes Indian writing as opposed to, say, German (Clyne 1981, 1987) or Japanese (Hinds 1981, 1983) writing. A comprehensive treatment of the topic, obviously, is beyond the scope of this paper. I will then present examples from Indian English writing to show that these follow the Indian conventions (in spirit if not in detail) rather than the norms of writing in the native English-speaking contexts (e.g., those of Britain or the U.S.A.). In conclusion, I will point out why research on writing conventions in international varieties of English is of crucial importance to the disciplines interested in cross-cultural communication.

INDIAN LINGUISTIC AND SOCIO-CULTURAL CONVENTIONS

As far as linguistic conventions are concerned, the claim that the Indian subcontinent constitutes a linguistic area has been explored in some detail and has been shown to be valid (Emeneau 1956, Ramanujan and Masica 1969, Masica 1976). In a recent Ph.D. dissertation, D'souza has presented convincing arguments to support her claim that India or South Asia is a sociolinguistic area as well (D'souza 1987). Both these claims are supported by evidence from several linguistic features uniquely attested in South Asian languages. In order to talk about conventions of writing, however, I have felt the need for referring to stylistic features as well. The total range of features that are essential to discuss the conventions of writing are thus the following:

(A) Conventions of Writing.

(1) Linguistic [i.e., phonology, morphology, lexis and syntax]

(2) Cultural

a. Discoursal [e.g., notions of cohesion (coherence), rhetorical structure, etc.]

b. Stylistic [e.g., idioms, notions of 'high style', 'images', 'allusions', etc.]

For the purposes of this paper, I will concentrate on selected aspects of word formation, syntactic constructions, and discoursal and stylistic conventions. A preliminary analysis of a large body of data suggests that these might be some of the most fruitful areas of investigation.

TRADITIONS OF WRITING IN INDIA VS. THE USA

Since it is impossible to treat the whole of India in a single limited study, let me take one example from the subcontinent to illustrate the point. In the overall context of Indian literatures, even a cursory glance at the history of Hindi literature makes it clear that Hindi is not the name of a language, rather, it is used as an apellation for a group of related languages/ dialects of the region known as *madhyadesha* in the north of India. I will not elaborate this point here (see Y. Kachru 1987b for a discussion of this point).

The history of Hindi literature begins around 800 A.D. In writing, the major tradition

that Hindi inherited was that of Sanskrit, and all the literary conceits and poetic conventions of Sanskrit are found in Hindi, too. It also adopted certain traditions of Perso-Arabic literature, under the influence of its close cousin, Urdu. Systematic development of prose in Hindi owes a great deal to the activities of the European missionaries in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. All the genres in prose, whether in literary or journalistic register, developed in the nineteenth century, and the language was gradually standardized between 1850 and the early decades of this century (See Rai 1984 for a detailed account of the development of Hindi and Urdu).

There is no tradition of rhetoric in the sense of "conventions of writing effectively for various purposes" in Hindi or any other modern Indian language. Composition is taught in schools, and essay writing continues at the college level. But there are no textbooks exclusively devoted to rhetoric in the above sense. There are textbooks on grammar and composition which contain grammatical descriptions, instructions and illustrations of parsing, a few remarks on organizing narrative, descriptive, argumentative, and personal essays, and a great many examples of ideal essays. Sometimes, a list of idioms, and a description of prosody are also included. Frequently, topics and outlines for writing essays are provided for teachers to use as homework assignments. The tradition of rhetoric in the sense of effective ways of conducting logical argumentation in the oral mode owes much to the tradition of the classical language, Sanskrit.

Existing accounts of Sanskrit tradition suggest that Indians 'think' in 'a circle or a spiral of continuously developing potentialities, and not on a straight line of progressive stages' as do the Westerners (Heimann 1964). The characterization of thought pattern of Indians as non-linear has been justified by pointing out the following facts: Indian concept of time is cyclic rather than linear; Indian logical syllogisms have a non-sequential structure (Das Gupta, 1975, p. 117); the melodic structure of Indian classical music is based on ten scale types which can be diagrammed as a circle (Jairazbhoy, 1975, p. 225); Indian art, especially the Buddhist frescoes at Ajanta, are non-lineal (Lannoy, 1971, p. 49), etc.

The non-linear structure of writing is widely attested in New Indo-Aryan languages as well. For instance, my earlier work on writing in Hindi (Y. Kachru 1983, 1987a) shows that the structure of expository essay in Hindi is spiral rather than linear, and the same pattern is encountered in Indian English expository writing as well (Y. Kachru 1987d). Similarly, Marathi is claimed to exhibit a circular structure in argumentative prose (Pandharipande 1983). The interaction of the oral and the literary traditions in India, extending over more than three thousand years, has been said to be responsible for the conventions of writing still followed in the Indian languages (Y. Kachru 1987d).

Although the relationship of 'thought patterns' to linguistic and rhetorical structures is debatable, it is clear that different language-speaking communities, and bi-/multilingual societies have developed different 'conventions' of speaking, writing, and other types of societal behavior. There is no doubt that the Indian conventions favor non-linearity, and looked at from the Western perspective, may seem to be 'circular' and hence, 'illogical'.

In view of the limitation of space I will refer to the conventions of writing in American English as an example of the native context.

According to Kaplan 1966 (also, 1980), the tradition of writing in English is based upon Platonic-Aristotelian thought patterns which are linear. The relationship between thought patterns and writing conventions is reflected in the paragraph structure in expository writing which "usually begins with a topic statement, and then, by a series of subdivisions of that topic statement, each supported by examples and illustrations, proceeds to develop that central idea and relate that idea to all other ideas in the whole essay, and then to employ that idea in proper relationships with the other ideas, to prove something, or perhaps to argue something." (Kaplan, 1980, p. 402) Kaplan then goes on to say that an English expository piece may employ either inductive or deductive reasoning.

Although concepts such as 'topic statement/ sentence' and 'inductive vs. deductive vs. mixed movement of paragraph' have come under increasing attack (e.g., see Winterowd, 1975a, p. 250), most texts on rhetoric still refer to these concepts and recommend editing paragraphs for 'clarity' and 'completeness' which in turn involve the concepts of topic sentence and linear development (see Winterowd, 1975b, p. 43; Young, Becker and Pike, 1970, pp. 321-326, among others).

For the discussion that follows, I will take the 'norm', or as D'Angelo calls it, the 'idealization' (1975, p. 26) of rhetorical structure reflected in Kaplan 1980 as representing the accepted norm of writing in American English, and contrast the discourse features of Indian English with them. The fact that the norm is not always, or even frequently, adhered to is not particularly relevant here, since the idealized norm generally determines a community's evaluation of other communities and their conventions. One has only to look at the studies in the field of teaching composition in the TESL/ TEFL context to be convinced of this (see, for example, the controversy generated by attempts at questioning the claims in Kaplan 1972 in the issues of TESOL Quarterly of September 1985 and September 1986).

DATA

The data for this study are drawn from several registers of Indian English (IE, hereafter), e.g., expository texts (genres of literary criticism and linguistics), academic writing on topics from education, and journalese (i.e., news articles and commentaries in newspapers).[1]

Linguistic Conventions

Consider the items underscored in text fragments presented in (B):

(B) Compounding.

(1) If we look at the quantum of firewood consumed in the cities, we can say that at least 2.3 million people must be engaged in *headloading* - bringing wood on their heads to sell in the towns - making the firewood trade the largest employer in the commercial energy sector of the country. ...Every *headloading* woman knows that the forest will soon be depleted ...
[*Surya*, Jan. '87, p. 33]

(2) The *jeep-taxi* skirts the Jaisalmer Fort ...
[*Frontline*, Jan. 24-Feb. 6, '87, p. 71]

(3) The streets are not more than three meters wide, cobbled and crowded with people, goats, cows, cyclists, *two-wheelers*,
[*Frontline*, Jan. 24-Feb. 6, '87, p. 80]

(4) You would get her on the telephone without any *star-excuses*...
[*Surya*, Jan. '87, p. 6]

(5) ...It is clear that his several stories here follow *emergency-propaganda* against strikes, rumours, hoarding, and so on.
[*IL*, 78, p. 200]

Compounds such as *headloading* and *star-excuses* are not attested in the native varieties of English. In fact, whereas it is at least possible to gather the meaning of the former in view of the explanation given in the text itself, it is difficult to see what the latter could mean. One has to be familiar with the total context of the text to extract the intended

meaning of the compound - the kind of excuses that film stars normally make in order to justify their reluctance to answer telephones or grant interviews. Similarly, *jeep-taxis* are jeeps that are for hire as taxis, and *two-wheelers* are motorized vehicles such as motorbikes; bicycles are excluded from the referents of the compound. Finally, the decoding of the compound *emergency-propaganda* demands a knowledge of the recent history of India - the propaganda that was carried out by the Government of India during the 'emergency period' between 1975-77. The processes followed in creating the compounds are not new, what is new is the product. Compounds such as *headloading*, of course, point to the need for systematic research into the productive processes utilized by the non-native varieties. Indian languages are notorious for their love of long nominal compounds and preference for compounding. In addition to compounding, there are other devices of word formation, such as hybridization, that augment the lexical stock of Indian English (See B. Kachru 1983 for a detailed discussion and exemplification of these processes).

The example in (C) illustrates the use of the syntactic device of a correlative construction:

(C) Correlative construction.

(1) ... they are brought up in *such* an atmosphere *where* they are not encouraged to express themselves upon such subjects in front of others ...
[Singh and Altbach, 1974, pp. 194-195]

(2) The position has traditionally belonged to *such* actresses *who* come to personify, at any given moment the popular ideal of physical beauty ...
[*India Today*, Sept. 30. '83, p. 44]

The correlative use of *such* with *where* or *who* is unattested in native varieties of English, the subordinators *where* and *who* by themselves are adequate for linking the two clauses in the two text fragments above. The use of *such* in (C1) for referring anaphorically to certain topics identified earlier in the text is, of course, in keeping with the conventions followed in the native varieties.

One could discuss other grammatical topics such as relative clauses and complements and show how the conventions of Indian English differ from native varieties. In view of the constraints of space, however, I would like to move on to the discoursal level.

Discoursal Conventions

I will confine my discussion to the cohesive devices of tenses, emphasis and linking only. Note the use of tenses is the text fragment in (D1):

(D) Cohesion.

(1) But significantly during the years 1976-77, a definite shift *is* noticeable in the poetic voices of the writers. They no longer *want to show* their anger - could it be because they *had displayed* too much of this so that nothing *had been left* behind - but reconciling themselves with the state of affairs they *went on looking* at life (perhaps wisely) fully understanding the realities of life. Therefore, in their poetry a better understanding of life and its problems and mysteries *would be reflected*. Though voices of anger *could be heard* in their poems the voices *are* not sentimental and exasperated but they *are* voices coming from a better understanding of life. ...
[*IL*, 1978, pp. 242-243]

The second sentence of the quote begins with a present tense verb - *want to show* -

and ends with a past tense verb - *went on* - after the adversative conjunction *but*. There are instances of such lack of tense sequencing or agreement in Indian English narratives, too, as has been shown in Nelson's study of Raja Rao's novel *Kanthapura* (Nelson 1985). It is not the case that a shift from present to past or vice-versa is not grammatical in the native varieties of English; the shift usually represents a shift in perspective, and is signalled by some contextualizing cue (Quirk et.al., 1985, pp. 1454-1460). There are no such cues in the text cited here, so it is difficult for a reader to interpret the significance of past vs. present in this case following the grammatical conventions of the native varieties. I have shown elsewhere (Y. Kachru 1983) that the conventions of use of tenses in narratives in Indic languages such as Hindi are different from those of English and seem to get transferred in English translations of Hindi narratives even when the translator is a native speaker of English (see, e.g., Roadarmel 1972).

The devices utilized for emphasis are variety-specific, too, as is clear from the example in (2) below:

(2) These writers have visualized and improvised story plots to convey grossly progressive ideas (or formulae). The names *alone* of characters in these stories are Kashmiri but they do not in any manner touch upon *typical* Kashmiri life *as such*.

[*IL*, 1973, p. 286]

The use of *alone* in example (2) is illustrative of how emphasis is achieved in IE. A speaker of a native variety of English is liable to find the use of *alone* puzzling. The intended meaning is *Only the names of the characters ... are Kashmiri...* Note also the use of the redundant use of *typical* and *as such* for emphasis. Gumperz 1982a and 1982b contain several examples of the devices utilized by the speakers of IE for emphasis and how these lead to misunderstandings in interactions with the British English speakers. The studies in these volumes also suggest that the IE usage reflects attempts to match the use of emphatic and limiting particles in Indic languages.

Examples (3) and (4) illustrate yet another convention of cohesion:

(3) ... In short, Nepali is the dominant language of the lower Himalayan and sub-Himalayan regions of India. *Besides this*, more than three million people who speak Nepali as their mother-tongue are spread over Assam, Mizoram, ...

[*IL*, 1973, p. 154]

(4) ... The Nainital lake, ..., is highly polluted and, therefore dangerous. ... This apart, Nainital, at present, has a highly inadequate sewerage capacity. ...

[*Probe*, Jan. '87, p. 88]

Note the use of the linking device *besides this* in the sense of *besides* in the first, and *This apart* in the sense of *in addition* for linking two paragraphs in the second excerpt. I have discussed elsewhere a few more examples of linking devices variety-specific to IE (Y. Kachru 1987d).

The next, a longer fragment under this heading, quoted in (5) below, provides a taste of the cumulative effect of several conventions unfamiliar to users of other varieties:

(5) In every field of activity today, there *seems* a certain furious *churning up* going on in the inexorable process of sociodynamics and that in the hope of finding suitable solutions for the many ills that have beset social and individual existence. Two major pulls seem to be tugging at each other: one is *of* newer and newer reforms in the socio-political field and the other is *towards* the revival of old values. Reforms are for immediate gains of organized groups struggling for social recognition, opportunities and a better status within the

> present framework, and revival for restoring *'the Glory that was Ind'* and for an enduring, value-based social order. The literary expression of the latter naturally acquires a nostalgic aura which is endearing to the traditionalist and irritating to the social realist. This polarity was experienced by Matthew Arnold in England in the 19th century *itself*. He projected it in the context of poetry as an opposition between 'Culture and Anarchy'. This polarity is modified by according to the nature of the particular culture and the *Time-spirit* prevailing in a particular country. ... So far as Marathi literature at the moment is concerned, *two major streams, in almost all literary forms*, can be detected. *One, of nostalgia for the ethical beauty of the old world and the other, for shaping a realistic future for the under-privileged and the outcastes of the society.* ...
>
> [*IL*, 1985, pp. 101-102]

First, the new phrasal and/ or prepositional verb *churning up*, the use of the demonstrative *that* following the conjunction *and* to link up with the *churning up*, the conjoining of phrases beginning with *of* and *towards*, the unexpected abbreviation in *'the Glory that was Ind'*, the use of *itself* in the sense of *as early as*, and finally, the compound *Time-spirit*, the mixed metaphor in *streams* followed by *forms*, and finally, the incomplete sentence (italicized). While it is difficult to claim that this is a typical paragraph of IE writing, it does point to the need for further research on conventions of writing in the international varieties in general.

A whole range of examples can be presented to show how IE extends or puts restrictions on rules of grammar and use of cohesive devices as compared to the native varieties of English and thereby creates a variety-specific grammar and principles of cohesion. The examples illustrating IE rules of usage can be shown to affect all topics in a grammatical description: articles, prepositions, countability of nouns, transitivity, tenses, aspects modals, complementation, relativizations, etc. But, that must await another and more detailed study.

Moving on to rhetorical structures, I will very briefly discuss the structure of paragraphs in IE expository writing.

Much has been written recently on the structure of paragraphs, including their psychological reality (see, e.g., Koen, Becker and Young 1969, Makino 1978, 1981), syntactic and/ or semantic bases of the perception of their coherence, and other such properties. In my earlier papers, I have attempted to show that the paragraph structure of Indian English is much looser as compared to that of the native varieties of English (Y. Kachru 1983, 1987d). Consider the excerpt in (E1) below:

(E) Rhetorical structure.

(1) SECULAR POETRY OF THE AGE OF DEVOTIONAL POETS

> Poetry written during *Bhakti kal* was predominantly devotional or spiritual. It included different varieties. The poetry of Kabir was different from that of Sur or Tulsi in many ways and the foreign associations of the Sufi poets marked them out. But invarably the theme and tone was non-secular. ... The climax was reached when devotional poetry attained maturity and final excellence in the reign of Akbar, the Great. Surdas and Tulsi Das lived and composed their best poetry during the reign of that great monarch, though they did not enjoy his direct patronage. [There were other poets, however, who came directly under the influence of the Emporer, who was a great lover of letters and patron of the learned and talented.] His court was a rendezvous of poets and philosophers whom he encouraged and rewarded munificently.
>
> The most prominent among the poets who lived in the court of Akbar

were ..., but there were many others who either visited the court from time to time or enjoyed its rich amenities for fairly long periods. [The creations of these poets differ in many ways from those of the poets who belonged to the cult of Sur or Tulsi. They have no spiritual implications are of the earth, earthy. The motive is predominantly secular and often erotic.] ...
[Dwivedi, 1966, p. 79]

The chapter heading sets up the expectation that the chapter will be concerned with secular poetry. The sentence enclosed in square brackets in the first paragraph seems to lead to a statement about the secular poets. But, the expectation is not fulfilled. The orthographic paragraph digresses into a description of Akbar's court, and the beginning of the second paragraph continues this digression. The theme of secular poets is picked up in the second sentence of the second paragraph, made more explicit in the third and fourth sentences, and continued to the end of the paragraph.[3] The second, third and fourth sentences are enclosed in square brackets as well.

The orthographic and semantic or thematic paragraphs need not be coextensive in Indian writing. Besides, a great deal of digression is tolerated in expository and other types of prose. In fact, as has been mentioned earlier in the paper, interesting suggestions have been made about Indian thinking in general being circular and/or spiral in works dealing with the history of Indian art, logic, music, literature, i.e., cultural history of India (e.g., Heimann 1964, Lannoy 1971). In view of the debate concerning the strong version of the Whorfian hypothesis, it seems unlikely that different communities have different thought patterns; it is more evident that different communities have different conventions for expressing thoughts appropriately.

Stylistic Conventions

A brief discussion of the stylistic conventions further illustrates the difference between the conventions of writing in American and Indian English. Note the creation of new idioms in Indian English (they are new in the sense that they are not found in the native varieties):

(F) Idioms.

(1) Akhtar had already published some excellent short stories in Kashmiri when he received a call *to turn the sod in the field of the novel.*
[*IL*, 1973, p. 293]

The idiom in (F1) is highly interpretable, though unusual according to the conventions of the native varieties.

The examples in (2-4) below illustrate a notion of 'high style' which is shared by Indic languages though not by the native varieties of English. Such overwhelming use of attributives, metaphors, etc. are rarely found in academic writing in the native varieties of English.

(2) There is no need to despair. Urdu literature has at last come upon a patch of green in the barren wilderness. It should, indeed, serve as the harbinger of a new spring. What should have come at the end of this survey has pushed itself to the forefront to epitomise a whole period in a crisis-ridden phase of Urdu language and literature. Its significance lies in its cataclysmic awareness that it has unfolded.
[*IL*, 1978, p.107]

(3) Next to Subrahmania Bharati who lit the passion for freedom in the hearts of millions of his countrymen and made it glow into a blazing fire by virtue of

his soul-stirring verses in the first two decades of the present century, the most outstanding poet of Tamil Nadu was Desikavinayagam, dubbed Kavimani or the Bell of Poetry.

[*IL*, 1973, p. 97]

(4) ... Noam Chomsky, *a young rebel with a brain like a burning blue flame*, appeared on the linguistic scene with a book called ... which promised a new direction in linguistics.

[Krishnaswamy, 1971, p. 135]

Finally, let me present an example of imagery related to allusions typical to the Indian context:

(G) Imagery.

(1) Looking for Indianness can be as baffling as trying to scoop out the hypothetical soul from the human body. The expression Indian is itself an abstraction and hard enough to pin-point. Indianness is doubly so, not a little removed from the concrete or cement or reality as it confronts *the five horse senses and their charioteer, the mind behind.*

[*IL*, 1973, p. 5]

Note that the compound *horse sense* in (G1) has not been used in its usual sense, it has been used in the plural which warns the reader it is not to be taken as a native-variety item. The compound here means senses which are like horses - ever ready to bolt away. In Indian philosophical and religious literature, the five senses have often been compared to spirited horses and the mind, the controller of the senses, to a charioteer.

CONCLUSION

The examples presented here make it clear that Indian English writing represents attempts to transcreate the cultural norms of writing in the other tongue. I call it transcreation because it is not straightforward translation. In fact, a word to word translation of some of the excerpts quoted here into an Indian language such as Hindi does not make very good sense. But the effect that is created by the devices closely approximates the effect anticipated in comparable genres of writing in Indic languages. The perceptible difference in Indian English is attributable to this transcreation of conventions, and often leads to pragmatic failure in communication with the users of native varieties. More research is needed to gain insight into the productive processes of word formation, the limits of extension of grammatical rules or restrictions placed upon them, the patterns of use of cohesive devices and what they signal, and finally, the rhetorical structure of texts for an appreciation of the new varieties of English. Writing is an important mode of communication, and unless a reasonable level of communication is attained among the speakers of English all over the world, even the shared language may not insure us against the effects of the biblical Tower of Babel. Discourse analysis has so far largely dealt with texts produced in monolingual communities, a more complete understanding of text production and interpretation is impossible without a thorough analysis of texts produced in bi-/multilingual contexts as well. For instance, it is not possible to arrive at any conclusion about the nature of paragraph, or topic initiation, maintenance, and shift, without a thorough investigation of these phenomena in bi-/multilingual contexts. Professionals interested in Applied Linguistics and English as an International Language can hardly afford to ignore the challenge presented by the international varieties of the world language English.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the American Institute of Indian Studies for a fellowship and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for a sabbatical leave of absence without which research leading to this study would not have been possible. An earlier version of this paper was presented on August 17, 1987 at the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics held at Sydney, Australia.

THE AUTHOR

Yamuna Kachru is a Professor in the Department of Linguistics and the Division of English as an International Language of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

NOTES

[1]The following sources of data have been utilized in this study (the periodicals are listed following the books): Dwivedi, R. A. (1966). *A critical survey of Hindi literature*. Dehli: Motilal Banarsidass; Krishnaswamy, N. *An introduction to linguistics for language teachers*. Bombay: Somaiya Publications Pvt. Ltd.; *Indian Literature* (abbreviation: *IL*), a literary bi-monthly published by the Sahitya Akademi, New Dehli; *Probe* and *Surya*, monthly magazines published from Allahabad and New Dehli, respectively; and *Frontline* and *India Today*, fortnightly magazines published from Madras and New Dehli, respectively.

[2]This may be a translation of the German expression *Zeitgeist*. I am thankful to Phillip Morrow for pointing this out.

[3]Note that the antecedent of *these poets* in the second sentence of the second paragraph does not seem to be in the text quoted here. The chapter goes on to discuss poets who neither lived in Akbar's court, nor enjoyed his patronage in any way.

REFERENCES

Besnier, N. (1986). Spoken and written registers in a restricted literary setting. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

Clyne, M. (1981). Culture and discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics, 5*, 61-66.

Clyne, M. (1987). Discourse structure and discourse expectations: implications for Anglo-German academic communication. In L.E. Smith (Ed.) *Discourse across cultures: strategies in World Englishes*. (pp. 73-83). New York: Prentice-Hall.

D'Angelo, F.J. (1975) *A conceptual theory of rhetoric*. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop.

Das Gupta, S.N. (1975). Philosophy. In A.L. Basham (Ed.) *A cultural history of India*. (pp. 111-123). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

D'souza, J. (1987). South Asia as a sociolinguistic area. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.

Emeneau, M.B. (1956). India as a linguistic area. *Language, 32:1*, 3-16.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982a). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982b). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S.B. (1981). Toward an ethnohistory of writing in American Education. In M.F. Whiteman (Ed.), *Writing: the nature, development, and teaching of written communication*, Vol. I: *Variation in writing: functional and linguistic-cultural differences* (pp. 25-45). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Heimann, B. (1964). *Facets of Indian thought*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Hinds, J. (1981). Paragraph structure in Japanese expository prose. In S. Makino (Ed.),. *Papers from the Middlebury Symposium on Japanese Discourse Analysis*. Urbana, IL.

Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text, 3*, 183-195.

Jairazbhoy, N. (1975). Music. In A.L. Basham (Ed.) *A cultural history of India*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kachru, B.B. (1982). Meaning in deviation: toward understanding non-native English texts. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.) *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Kachru, B.B. (1983). *The Indianization of English: the English language in India*. Dehli: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B.B. (1987). The bilingual's creativity. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 125-140). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Kachru, Y. (1983). Linguistics and written discourse in particular languages: Contrastive studies: English and Hindi. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 3*, 50-77.

Kachru, Y. (1987a). Expository prose in Hindi and English: conventions of writing in selected registers. In A Purves (Ed.), *Contrastive rhetoric: themes and case studies*. Written Communication Annual 3. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. (In press)

Kachru, Y. (1987b). Impact of expanding domains of use on a standard language: contemporary Hindi in India. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences, 17:1*, 73-90.

Kachru, Y. (1987c). Hindi-Urdu. In B. Comrie (Ed.), *The world's major languages*. London: Croom Helm.

Kachru, Y. (1987d). Cross-cultural texts, discourse strategies and discourse interpretation. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: strategies in World Englishes*. (pp. 87-100). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Kaplan, R.B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning, 16*, 1-20. Also in K. Croft (Ed.) (1980), *Readings on English as a second language for teachers and teacher trainees* (pp. 399-418). Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop.

Kaplan, R.B. (1972). *The anatomy of rhetoric: prolegomena to a functional theory of rhetoric*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development (Concord, Mass.: Heinel and Heinle).

Koen, F., A. Becker and R. Young. (1969). The psychological reality of the paragraph. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 8*, 49-53.

Lannoy, R. (1971). *The speaking tree: a stody of Indian culture and society*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Makino, S. (1978). Paragraph: Is it a legitimate linguistic unit? A case study from English and Japanese. In R. Brown and M. Steinman (Eds.) *Rhetoric 78: Proceedings of theory of rhetoric: an interdisciplinary conference*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Center for Advanced Study in Language Style and Literary Theory.

Makino, S. (Ed.) (1981). *Papers from the Middlebury Symposium on Japanese Discourse Analysis*. Urbana, IL.

Masica, C.P. (1976). *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nelson, C. (1985). My language, your culture: whose communicative competence? *World Englishes, 4:2*, 243-250.

Pandharipande, R. (1983). Linguistics and written discourse in particular languages: Contrastive studies: English and Marathi. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 3*, 118-136.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J Svartvik. (1972). *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.

Rai, A. (1984). *A house divided: the origin and development of Hindi/ Hindavi*. Dehli: Oxford University Press.

Ramanujan, A.K. and C.P. Masica. (1969). Toward a phonological typology of the Indian linguistic area. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current trends in linguistics, 5*, 543-577.

Roadarmel, G.C. (Trans.) (1972). *Modern Hindi short stories*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Scollon, R. and S. Scollon. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Scribner, S. (1979). Modes of thinking and ways of speaking: culture and logic reconsidered. In R.O. Freedle (Ed.), *New directions in discourse processing* (pp.

223-243). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Smith, L. and C. Nelson. (1985). International intelligibility of English: directions and resources. *World Englishes, 4:3*, 333-342.
Whiteman, M.F. (1981). *Writing: the nature, development, and teaching of communication.* Vol.I. *Variation in writing: functional and linguistic-cultural differences.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Winterowd, W.R. (1975a). *Contemporary rhetoric: a conceptual background with readings.* New York: Harcourt Brace.
Winterowd, W.R. (1975b). *The contemporary writer: a practical rhetoric.* New York: Harcourt Brace.
Young, A.E., A.L. Becker and K.L. Pike. (1970). *Rhetoric: discovery and change.* New York: Harcourt Brace.